R E P O R T  R E S U M E S

ED 014 268 JC 660 257

THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE POLICY MAKING.

BY- BENTLEY, NORMA E.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.64 14P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, EDUCATIONAL POLICY, *POLICY FORMATION, GOVERNANCE, CAZENOVIA, NEW YORK,

BY VIRTUE OF THEIR COMPETENCE IN SPECIFIC DISCIPLINES AND IN EDUCATION, JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTIES ARE QUALIFIED TO MAKE RESPONSIBLE DECISIONS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY MATTERS AND SHOULD HAVE AN ACTIVE, MEANINGFUL ROLE IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE. THE EXTENT OF SUCH PARTICIPATION SHOULD BE THE SAME AS IN OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. FACULTIES SHOULD BE PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING EDUCATIONAL POLICIES IN THEIR INSTITUTIONS, FOR DETERMINING FACULTY MEMBERSHIP, FOR BUDGETING, AND FOR SELECTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS. THEY SHOULD BE FULLY INFORMED ABOUT INSTITUTIONAL PLANS AND EXPENDITURES. SUCH FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IS POSSIBLE ONLY WHEN THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT IS RESPONSIBLE DIRECTLY TO THE GOVERNING BOARD AND THE BOARD IS SEPARATE FROM THOSE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THE STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES FOR EFFECTING FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE WILL VARY AMONG INSTITUTIONS. CLEAR AND OPEN CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION ARE ESSENTIAL. (WO)

ERIC

ED014268

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE POLICY MAKING

by Norma E. Bentley
Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, N.Y.

It is unthinkable prima facie that professional people should not have a responsible, effective role in determining the policies they are to follow in carrying on their professional work. It is inconceivable that a faculty should not participate in the governance of the institution of higher education of which it is a functional part, in which, indeed, it carries on the major tasks for which the institution was set up.

Without participation faculty members, no matter what their competence or rank, are reduced to the ignominious role of cows producing milk under the conditions provided for them, however good, however bad, yet with the quality of their product in large part determined by those very conditions. Needless to say, although the quality of a faculty's production, the teaching and research, is, like that of the herd, in large part determined by external conditions, teachers are not dumb and docile beasts without power of reason; rather they are rational, articulate, accountable human beings, without whose cooperation in determining policy it is doubtful that any academic institution can provide the context in which teaching and learning can be most effectively conducted, can, that is, fulfill to the maximum its obligations to its students and the community.

Despite the harsh remarks sometimes uttered of teachers in community colleges, they can determine what factors are necessary for learning to take place far better than a lay board operating alone, however interested and intelligent and skilled in their own spheres its members, and certainly far better than an agency of state government. By virtue of their knowledge and experience in their particular disciplines and in education itself, the

JC 660 257

faculty are the more qualified. Legal responsibility, it is true, is invested in the lay board and the state, but full-time active involvement, it must be conceded, belongs mainly to the faculty and, of course, the administrative officers; in practice most colleges and universities today recognize their responsibility. Clearly it is an affront not only to the capacity of the faculty but to their very dignity as human beings to deprive them of a role for which they are peculiarly fitted, that of meaningful participation in college governance. Only under the most extraordinary circumstances should their recommendations in the areas which are clearly their concern be rejected.

It is especially important today for the faculty of community colleges to play an effective role in governance since these institutions are being continually pressed now to upgrade themselves and challenged to prove worthy of inclusion within the body of higher education in the United States. Those who teach, without as well as within community colleges, are, of course, particularly concerned. The Faculty Association of the State of New York, for example, continues to call for "a much-needed upgrading of community colleges" within that state.[1] And, as its self-survey published in the spring of 1965 shows, the American Association of University Professors, a national organization, is for its own reasons equally concerned; there is even some agitation within it to restrict its membership to faculty members in those two-year colleges, not merely accredited, but possessing acceptable professional standards and atmosphere, with the avowed expectation that such restriction will aid community colleges to improve themselves. In such improvement, obviously,

faculty participation in policy decisions is in the mind of AAUP both a means and an end. The AAUP Bulletin reported that "The Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors supports the efforts of the faculty members of junior and community colleges to achieve responsible participation in the governance of their institutions. . . . Faculty partcipation. . . should be a major factor in their accreditation."[2] That the American Association of Junior Colleges is also increasingly taking an interest in the issue is not without significance.

What basic assumptions underlie this increasing interest in and demand for faculty participation in policy making at the community college level? Some I have already suggested, but there are others. For purposes of clarity and emphasis let me here marshall the main arguments. First and most fundamental, two-year community colleges belong in the category of institutions of higher learning, not in that of secondary schools; they cannot but reflect most aspects of four-year colleges and universities, including those related to the faculty's role in making policy. (If some community colleges there be which belong to another category they should perhaps call themselves technical training schools or something of the sort and thus cease to becloud the issue.) Even though as its name implies a community college must be particularly sensitive to the instructional needs of the area in which it is located, it should, as an institution of higher learning, endeavor to meet those needs within the pattern sanctioned by custom and efficacy in colleges and universities, with due attention to academic freedom and responsibility.

That there is a direct relationship between the work of an institution and the structure set up to accomplish it is clear. That a structure for college governance in which the faculty

participates effectively is more likely to facilitate than impede education is also clear. It is the faculty which implements policy decisions concerned with education; the faculty, furthermore, can impede as well as implement. Certainly low morale, usually a deterrent to productive work, however well-meaning the workers, can often be attributed to a faculty's having an inadequate role in governance: they are frustrated in efforts to effect an improvement in conditions; they lack essential dignity. Surely, by virtue of their competence in specific disciplines and in education, the faculty of community colleges belong to the academic profession and are capable of responsible decisions in matters of educational policy, their particular concern and sphere. After all, as Richard P. Adams wrote in an article on Tulane's governance, "The purpose of faculty participation. . . is not merely to illustrate some ideal form of democracy. It is to insure, as much as insurance can, that administrative authority is always used in the service of academic authority, and never allowed to get in the way of learning."[3]

Needless to say, the faculty, I presuppose, has considerable stability; its members show responsibility toward the college and willingness to give time and energy to policy; they are scholarly and mature. That for the most part they ought as individuals and as a group to be such people does point up some of the problems currently faced by all institutions of higher learning in these days of rapid technological change, increasing student population, and necessary experimentation in teaching methods: namely, recruitment, maintenance, and improvement of faculty and professional standards. To the faculties of colleges and universities it is patent that solution of these problems is dependent in no small

measure on faculty participation in governance. Surely what is true of community colleges where the same problems exist and often in more acute form.

To what extent should the faculty of a community college participate in policy-making? To be general--and realistic--the answer must be no less and no more than in other institutions of higher learning. Accordingly, I here endorse fully and, indeed, borrow extensively from the Statement of Principles on faculty participation in college and university government approved in 1962 by the Council of the American Association of University Professors.[4] The statement takes cognizance of the fact that governing boards, administrations, and faculty are all rightly concerned with policy and have certain "common responsibilities" which "make it necessary that the faculty be fully informed and free to participate actively in the government of the institution," expecially in the area of its particular competence. "The faculty should have primary responsibility for determing the educational policies of the institution." It should be concerned also with faculty membership and with the selection of administrative officers. Finally, it should have a hand in budgeting and be kept fully informed of plans and expenditures.

To permit in the community college such extensive faculty involvement, legislation may be needed to make the president directly responsible to the governing board of the college and to make the college board exclusive of those of elementary and secondary school systems. If so it should be sought without delay.

Educational policies comprehend provision for faculty research, requirements for admission (perhaps disciplinary distribution as well as quality) and graduation, conduct of examinations, academic

standards including grading, methods of instruction, course content, and curriculum; it should perhaps be stressed here parenthetically that no new course or program should normally be added without the concurrence of the faculty. In addition, educational policies include extracurricular activities insofar as these have a bearing on a student's academic performance, and any measures relating to students' freedom of expression. The AAUP Statement points out that certain other decisions may well be considered related to educational policy and that, therefore, the faculty should be involved in making them: these "include major changes in the size of the student body, significant alterations in the academic calendar, the establishment of new. . . divisions, the provision of extension services to the community, and assumption by the institution of research or service obligations to private or public agencies." To these I should add major alteration or expansion of the physical plant. Incidentally, the article in the Junior College Journal for May, 1965, showing the extent to which the faculty of Mesa College participated in the planning of a new science building makes clear both the need and the desirability for assuring the faculty of such a role, as well as a method for doing so.

The faculty should participate actively in appointments, reappointments, promotions, and in the granting of tenure; only under extraordinary circumstances should its recommendations be denied. It should also have a hand in the selection of administrative personnel, whether of presidents or deans or the chairment of divisions or departments, and be involved in the retention of chairment, whose limited term, perhaps expiring the year they become eligible for a sabbatical, should be subject to renewal.

The Faculty Association of the State of New York rightly wishes to have faculty concerned with the appointment of such other personnel as directors of research; certainly still others might well be included at the pleasure of the faculty. In an established department or division with seasoned personnel, the office of chairman might well be elective. Should there be occasion to consider establishing or abolishing departments or divisions, the faculty should be consulted and its advice heeded.

That part of the budget concerned with instructional matters should be determined by the educational policies set up by the faculty and in consultation with the faculty and, of course, their administrative representatives. Since any one part of the budget affects the rest, the faculty needs to be kept informed of expenditures and of administrative planning which will involve capital outlay, particularly in the formative stages; it should be consulted on any proposed policy changes which will be reflected in the budget.

Obviously a structure must be worked out and procedures established to effectuate the faculty role in governance. As the AAUP Statement points out, these will of necessity vary from institution to institution. What I suggest for discussion here is, therefore, subject to a great deal of modification to fit the needs of any existing community college. Moreover, I am thinking in terms of the college as a single entity; I do not include reference to a senate made up of representatives of the community colleges within a state or a particular area, although such a body is not only desirable but necessary as a forum for faculty expressions of opinion, for receiving, assessing, and coordinating recommendations from individual colleges, and as a sort of pressure group to exert faculty influence. Indeed, in

1963, the AAUP "supported legislative efforts to establish faculty senates at the publicly supported junior colleges in California. ."[5]

Provision should be made for the faculty of the community college to have regularly-held faculty meetings, at which reports and recommendations from established committees are approved, amended, referred back to committee, or rejected. The faculty may want to set up most of the following standing committees, perhaps with different names: admissions committee, library committee, student affairs committee, curriculum committee, instruction committee, and perhaps a committee on traffic control. It is useful also to have an executive committee or faculty committee, also standing, to study, recommend, and act on matters concerning the faculty. This last may concern itself with appointments and promotions, or there may be a temporary promotions committee to deal with rank and tenure, or a specific committee on appointments and promotions. Other ad hoc consultative and advisory committees will be needed from time to time, for example, when the selection of a new president becomes necessary, or possibly if the faculty becomes unusually concerned over such matters as fringe benefits. The faculty will also act in many instances through departments or divisions. In addition, it may at least for a time need to unite outside the college in some sort of organization like the AAUP or the American Federation of Teachers which is not only concerned with standards but can represent it for collective bargaining with the state. Ultimately, however,,the faculty should be so organizes as to be able to represent itself. In any case, its natural desire for collective bargaining should not be gainsaid. It is, of course, to the advantage of the college as a whole for faculty to be adequately remunerated. Victor S. Bryant of the Board of Trustees of the University of California put the

case well: "No teacher can do his best work when involved in debt and harassed by bill collectors. Like dew, but perhaps not so gently, the high cost of living falls on the professor as well as the layman."[6] And as Bryant points out, one way to retain good faculty, to whom offers are bound to come, is to pay them well. It is also a way to build up an outstanding faculty. They should, incidentally, have more than just an acceptable salary. They should also have, for example, travel allowances so that they can attend meetings of learned societies in their disciplines. And sabbaticals are important both to them and to the college. There are a number of fringe benefits to be considered.

When the faculty meets as a whole to deliberate and take action on recommendations, certain questions immediately arise. Who may attend? Who may vote? Practice, of course, varies. Probably the dean, the assistant dean should there be one, and all members of the instructional staff (instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, professors) should have the right to attend and vote, although in a community college particularly there is considerable merit in witholding the vote from instructors until after they have served at least one full year. Accorded to other administrative officers would be the right to attend, with the privilege of the floor, but not of the vote. Among these "other administrators" are the director of admissions, the business manager or comptroller, the director of the library, the director of public relations, the registrar, and the dean of students. Should there be others whom the President wishes to invite it would be courteous, if no more, for him to do so only after having consulted the faculty or its executive committee.

Procedures are at least as important as structure: they should be carefully considered and explicitly formulated by the faculty. regulations approved by the faculty should then be officially accepted by the college and published. Included among such procedures is the setting up of committees or choosing their personnel; a variety of ways are possible, no one of which appears to have more value than any other for the community college. One useful method is for the faculty committee or executive committee or a nominating committee, itself elected in the same way as the others, to present to the faculty a month or so before the election a list of those eligible for election and a list of nominees for each committee; voting may then be by preferential ballot. If a committee is to have executive power, the faculty may elect a panel from which the dean together with some other administrative officer or officers may select the membership. What is important is not what precise method is chosen but that the faculty should determine the method and the administration accept and publish it.

It should be established practice in making appointments to the faculty for the dean to consult with a committee on appointments if there is one and if not with department and division heads, who have, it is understood, consulted either formally or informally senior faculty members in the candidate's discipline.

There should be an established procedure for setting up a faculty committee when the office of president is about to become or has become vacant; it would be well if that committee's functions were generally, perhaps just tacitly, understood. The committee,

for example, might be expected to put before the board of trustees the faculty's thinking on the qualifications of a president and eventually a list of candidates acceptable to the faculty. A meeting of the faculty committee with a committee from the board to consider and eliminate names is likely to be useful. This sort of conference occurred and proved most helpful when Tulane University selected a president. At the joint meeting some 150 names were reduced to four, any one of which the faculty would heartily approve; the Board then made the final choice. Presumably there would be far fewer candidates for the board of a community college to consider, but these should not be singled out and decided on without the advice of the faculty.

If the community college is too sizable to permit departments to work as a whole on budgets and make proposals to their heads, budget committees should be set up in the larger departments for this purpose. The department or division heads should then discuss the budgets presented to them with the dean, who will carry on the proposals to the comptroller. Once a budget has been finally approved by the president and the board, the departments or divisions should be informed at once of their allocation.

Whatever structure is considered for faculty participation in college government, one major concern should be to allow for organized channels of communication among the board, the administration and the faculty; these should make possible the direct presentation of faculty views to the board. For example, reports may go from faculty committees through the agency of administrative officers to the

board; faculty members may sit on board committees; faculty members may be invited to attend board meetings or representatives of the faculty may sit on the board. Some institutions bring faculty and board together for informal dinners and discussion. In any case, although the administration should not be by-passed, trustees and faculty would have comfortable access to each other whenever they want it.

There are a few guidelines in the matter of faculty participation in governance which the community college cannot ignore. These presuppose that the college, having assured to the faculty those protections prescribed by the AAUP in its 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, has articulated its objectives and is at least beginning to define the respective roles of its governing board, administration, and faculty. It should clearly delegate to the faculty decisions on matters of educational policy; that the faculty have control of the curriculum is basic. It should then empower the faculty to work out with its administrative officers a committee structure and procedures satisfactory to all concerned. Once these are adopted, it should see that they are published and implemented. Finally it should espouse the practice of ascertaining the studied thinking of the faculty, possibly through the agency of ad hoc deliberative bodies, on issues not directly concerned with educational policy on which decisions are to be made; this thinking must be seriously considered. Only when channels of communication are clear and open and used, and administrative officers and the

board show genuine respect for the faculty's responsibility and authority in educational matters and regard for the faculty's thinking in others is the faculty likely to show high morale and the institution be capable of solid academic achievement.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Martin L. Fausold, "President's Progress Report," Faculty Association News, Vol. IX, No. 1, September, 1965, p. 1.

2. AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 2, June, 1964, p. 189

3. Richard P. Adams, "Tulane University: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University, AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 49, No. 3, September, 1963, p. 221.

4. AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 49, No. 3, September, 1963, pp. 253-258.

5. Ibid., p. 293

6. Victor S. Bryant, "The Role of the Regent," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 4, December, 1964, p. 321